

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

I believe that the FCC, and governments as a whole, exist to serve the people, not special interests whose de-facto agenda appears to be the wholesale subversion of the democratic system of government that is the basis of our way of life. To me, this means that a person publishing a weekly newsletter via e-mail on the Internet deserves the same attention and interest from the FCC as does Time-Warner.

I personally suffer from a ridiculous situation where I only have one choice of ISP, and that ISP does not allow me to publish my own works on the Internet (i.e. does not allow me to run my own servers). To me, this amounts to a half-baked version of digital television, not Internet access. No other broadband access is economically available in my area, apparently thanks to the foibles of the Telecommunications Act of 1996. Incidentally, my ISP is one of the so-called "media" companies that makes most of its money by streaming canned content to consumers. I don't see that it has a lot of interest providing "true" Internet access (i.e. two way communications, peer based publishing, etc.).